

**Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)**  
**April 20, 2017**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.*

**[In these minutes:** IT Governance; Bold Action for Equity and Diversity; Faculty Senate Constitution & Bylaw Changes; System-Wide Strategic Plan]

**PRESENT:** Colin Campbell (chair), Catherine French, Dan Feeney, Kathleen Krichbaum, Michael Kyba, Donna Spannaus-Martin, George Trachte, Susan Wick, Robert Blair, Shawn Curley, Janet Ericksen, Peggy Nelson, Ruth Okediji, Amy Pittenger, Peter Tiffin

**REGRETS:** Joseph Konstan, Monica Luciana, Greta Friedemann-Sanchez

**ABSENT:** Michael Oakes

**GUESTS:** Kemal Badur, senior director, Office of Information Technology; Richard Matson-Daley, IT liaison, Office of Information Technology; Larry Storey, IT liaison, Office of Information Technology; Laura Dupont-Jarrett, chief of staff for the Associate Dean of Academic Programs & Faculty Affairs, CFANS; Professor L'Aurette Johnson, College of Pharmacy; Holley Locher, chief of staff, College of Design; Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Rebecca Ropers-Huilman; Chancellor Stephen Lehmkuhle; Meredith Fox, CEO, Portage Partners Consulting

**OTHERS ATTENDING:** Vice President for Equity and Diversity Katrice Albert, and Assistant Vice Provost Virajita Singh, Office for Equity and Diversity

1. **IT governance:** Professor Campbell convened the meeting, welcomed those present and called for a round of introductions. Following introductions, Professor Campbell welcomed today's guests from the Office of Information Technology who asked to come before the committee to hear from members what the Office of Information Technology (OIT) can do to support faculty in delivering the mission of the University. He then turned the meeting over to Larry Storey, IT liaison, to facilitate the discussion.

Mr. Storey noted that representatives from OIT are meeting with various groups across the University to get input on what OIT can do to better support the mission of the institution. Prior to the meeting, members were asked to think about four questions in order to facilitate this discussion, and they include:

1. Looking forward to the next year or two, what do you foresee affecting your research, teaching, outreach and/or administrative work most significantly?
2. What IT-related resources do you see that your peers from other institutions (and/or the private sector) have access to that you think would make a positive impact here?

3. What do you see peer institutions, or comparable non-higher education organizations investing in (or not investing in) that you think would be important for IT to invest in here?
4. What activity outside of your core mission seems to take up an outsized amount of departmental resources when compared to its impact?

Mr. Storey told members that the input they share today, along with the input from other groups across the institution, will be shared with IT leaders, and will serve to determine the direction OIT takes in the coming year. Members shared the following comments:

- More and more faculty are being hired who have big data needs, and it will be critical that the University be able to meet and support these needs.
- Any decisions that are made regarding switching learning management systems (LMS) should not be taken lightly. This is a big decision, which will have a significant impact on faculty, staff and students.
- Given the multitude of technologies used from class to class, it would be great if OIT could provide some recommendations regarding the various technologies, particularly as it relates to saving departments and students money.
- There is not enough wireless bandwidth to support all the technologies that are being used in classrooms; this has been an ongoing problem for years.
- More software plugins are needed on classroom computers.
- If faculty experience technical problems, and there is not support staff nearby to help, a whole class period can be lost. Also, calling the Help Desk when there are problems during a class is really not an option because there is not time to troubleshoot during a class.
- Additional active learning classrooms are needed because they are in high demand by both faculty and students.
- Some of the professional schools such as the Law School use law-specific software/technologies that central OIT is unfamiliar with. OIT should hold listening sessions to better understand the needs of the various schools.
- Data security training should be provided to everyone who handles data, not just faculty. Staff who assist faculty do not have the same access to data security training as faculty do.
- The Casper Suite uses Secure SSH and this is problematic for faculty who use a University laptop primarily off campus. Casper-supported computers sometimes update at inconvenient times and do not update when the computer is campus; if updates are not installed, the computer may lock out the user. Problems like this may encourage faculty to go out and buy their own computer and put stuff on it that probably should not be on a non-University computer.
- If there is a move to Canvas, it will be important for OIT to provide support to not only Twin Cities' faculty, but system campus faculty as well.
- Broadcasting of Twin Cities' Medical School seminars to Duluth continues to be problematic.
- WebEx has been problematic for some faculty. Additionally, ITV has not changed since the campus started using it in the 1990s and it has its own share of problems.

- Across programs (e.g., pharmacy and nursing) and across campuses (Twin Cities and Rochester) reliable, trouble-free connections are virtually impossible.
- Since the upgrade, it is extremely difficult to get course information such as what courses departments are offering and what courses been offered in the last few years, etc.
- Colleagues at other institutions are able to hold their classes via Skype or Oracle, if needed, versus recording a lecture or scheduling a make-up class. Additionally, it should be possible to connect guests into a class using technology as opposed to have them be physically present.
- The University's Wi-Fi network needs to be upgraded; other institutions have better Wi-Fi that the University, e.g., Indiana University, Rutgers University, Penn State University.
- Usability Services should periodically change up/re-order the questions it asks on its surveys because people that have already participated know where to find things.

In response to a question from Professor Campbell, Mr. Storey said OIT is meeting with a lot of people across campus and not just governance groups. For example, OIT is talking with every academic college and several departments. OIT is trying to meet with the people who are actually doing the work to understand their technology needs, etc. He added that OIT will likely meet with anywhere from 75 – 100 groups in an effort to gather as much input as possible.

On behalf of the FCC, Professor Campbell thanked the representatives from OIT for attending the meeting.

**2. Bold Action for Equity and Diversity:** To begin, Professor Campbell welcomed guests Laura Dupont-Jarrett, chief of staff for the Associate Dean of Academic Programs & Faculty Affairs, CFANS; Professor L'Aurette Johnson, College of Pharmacy; and Holley Locher, chief of staff, College of Design, and called for a round of introductions.

Dr. Dupont-Jarrett began with some background information about a quasi-grassroots equity and diversity initiative, which she said started a little over a year ago when a number of diversity professionals from across campus got together to discuss the many diversity-related initiatives that were happening on campus. During the course of the day, a group of those in attendance realized that the discussion was focusing on the amazing diversity-related work that is already taking place on campus but not focusing on doing more to create momentum for additional progress and movement. Around the same time, there was another meeting of diversity professionals on campus where the discussion turned to creating bold equity and diversity change/movement and what that would look like. Some fabulous ideas came out of this discussion, said Dr. Dupont-Jarrett, and the decision was made to do something with the ideas that had been generated. As a result, over the course of a about a year, she, and Drs. Johnson, Locher, and Madyun regularly met and prioritized the equity and diversity ideas that had been generated in consultation with colleagues and professionals across campus in an attempt to refine them. She then turned members' attention to the document that had been sent to them along with the agenda, *Bold Action for Equity and Diversity: Nine Critical Questions*

*for University Leadership*. The goal now is to try and figure out how to accomplish at least some of these ideas.

Professor Feeney said the document, in a number of places, talks about raising sensitivity and awareness in students and faculty and asked the guests to elaborate a little more on what this means. He added that all efforts to do this have a price tag associated with them. What can be done that would be reasonably cost effective? In Professor Feeney's opinion, in order to do any of these things there would need to be buy-in on the part of the deans and department heads/chairs. Dr. Johnson responded by saying that she thinks it will be college and unit specific, and said in her college, the College of Pharmacy, everyone is taking this initiative to heart in terms of developing students' cultural competencies in the health care field. For example, starting in fall 2017, the College of Pharmacy is going to have its students take the [Intercultural Development Inventory](#) (IDI) to get a baseline assessment of each student's cultural competence. After the initial assessment is taken, it will be periodically reassessed to see if they have moved or shifted along the cultural competence continuum. This is an example of something that can be done throughout the AHC and other colleges/units on campus. Dr. Dupont-Jarrett added that while there are local solutions at the collegiate or programmatic level, more universal things could be done as well. For example, expand the *Diversity and Social Justice in the United States* Liberal Education Theme requirement. In terms of local curriculum, CFANS is working with a small cohort of interested faculty and giving them the tools they need to incorporate intercultural competence and development into their current curriculum. By doing this, the hope is that undergraduate students will have some of this content infused into many of their courses – many touchpoints. Finally, Dr. Locher said in a recent conversation with Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman the idea came up for senior leaders on campus to attend diversity workshops to reinforce the notion that diversity is a priority for the campus.

Professor French asked who prepares the intercultural competence materials that some of the CFANS faculty are incorporating into their courses, and are these materials available to other colleges. Dr. Dupont-Jarrett said it is not so much materials per se, but helping faculty understand the concepts of intercultural competence so they can incorporate it into their curriculum. For CFANS, this involves their faculty working with their diversity and inclusion officer, and professionals from the Center for Educational Innovation (CEI) to see how these concepts can be included in typical disciplinary courses. Professor French said this sounds interesting, but if at some point there are materials that could be shared that would be helpful. Dr. Dupont-Jarrett volunteered to pull together resources for Professor French.

In Professor Campbell's opinion, while people have good intentions, the reality is that there is ignorance and bad practice. With that said, he agrees with Professor French in terms of identifying who is doing the good work and making it more available, but at the same time by doing this it encourages passivity on the part of others. He noted that he has been at the University for 24-years and has not seen much progress related to diversity.

In Professor Okediji's opinion, wanting to do good and having programs directed at doing good are very different from actually doing good. Often so much time and effort is put into trying to create the good that no effort is put into seeing if any progress is being made. The Office for

Equity and Diversity may want to step back and take an inventory of its current and past diversity initiatives, and if there is programming that is not working or is not producing the desired results, it should be retired. The University's approach to diversity should not be so homogeneous because some programming will work better at unit levels, others at collegiate levels and some should be University-wide. Too often units, colleges and the University are trying to do too much of the same thing at the same level and getting nowhere. There needs to be more of a strategic focus on diversity. Professor Campbell agreed that taking a data-driven approach to diversity programming is a good idea. Professor Okediji added that she believes diversity can become a culture and cultures are slow to change. Additionally, once there is a culture versus a commitment, the likelihood that the University will make little to no progress increases.

Professor Tiffin said faculty already have so much on their plates and to take on more is just not feasible even if it would benefit the community and the students. Rarely if ever are faculty told that they will be relieved of some of their responsibilities so they can focus on others. In response, Dr. Johnson said some of what faculty are being asked to do, they are already doing but may not be aware of it or documenting it. Dr. Dupont-Jarrett agreed with Professor Tiffin in that it is not possible to keep adding on to the faculty workload, but faculty need to realize they are powerful informal role models as well as content deliverers and it does not require a lot of time on the part of faculty to have an impact on students.

While faculty realize they have an obligation to intervene when students, for example, say or do something that is inappropriate/offensive, said Professor Pittenger, they do not always know how to handle these awkward situations. In situations like this, said Dr. Locher, it is good to have a network of colleagues to bounce ideas off of and to get advice from. It is all about getting faculty in the habit of talking to each other because not everyone knows what to do in a particular situation. Faculty should leverage each other whenever possible. Professor French suggested compiling diversity scenarios to help give faculty guidance so that it is possible to learn from each other's mistakes. In her opinion, faculty may make things worse despite the fact they are well intentioned. Dr. Johnson added that in order to make progress with diversity she believes there needs to be a baseline commitment to make a change going forward. For example, a way to elevate equity and diversity in the future could possibly entail including it in how faculty are evaluated, e.g., how is a faculty member's teaching, research, and service impacting equity and diversity.

Professor Campbell asked Professor Trachte his opinion about whether the Duluth campus has done a good job in acknowledging its debt to the Native communities. In response, Professor Trachte said the Duluth Medical School has made progress, but noted that the Morris campus has accomplished more with the Native communities than the Duluth campus. Professor Shrunck-Ericksen agreed with Professor Trachte's assessment of the Morris campus' accomplishments in this area, and noted that the Morris campus tries to include a Native American component in all its majors.

Professor Campbell congratulated Professor Tiffin on speaking up earlier about faculty always being asked to do more. While he agrees that equity and diversity is everyone's work, faculty already have a lot of work.

Professor Feeney said if the administration is really going to make a commitment to equity and diversity, mandatory training should be required. Professor French agreed, and suggested having the message come from the top down to set the example.

Professor Campbell thanked Drs. Dupont-Jarrett, Johnson and Locher for meeting with the FCC to discuss this important topic.

**3. Proposed changes to the Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws:** Professor Campbell turned members' attention to the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws and opened the floor for discussion. Professor Wick said she does not agree that if a faculty member drops below a 67% appointment that he/she should not be able to participate in the Senate or serve on Senate committees. She said she does not see how a person's appointment level correlates with their abilities to serve in governance. If the logic is to not have the Senate or its committees top heavy with older people, this does not solve the problem because retirement is not mandatory for faculty. What is this provision trying to achieve? If people are willing to do the work and are competent, she said she does not understand why they cannot serve. Professor French agreed. She added while she understands encouraging people to participate in governance who will be here for the long haul is a good idea, this provision bars a category of people who could also be valuable in governance.

Professor Campbell said the 67% appointment threshold is current policy and the language that was added just clarifies this and has nothing to do with the proposed changes to the constitution and bylaws, which the committee is discussing today. The motion before the committee is whether the FCC approves the proposed changes to the constitution and bylaws.

Based on members' comments related to the 67% minimum threshold to serve in governance, Professor Okediji said she is hearing members question whether this clarifying language should be added because the real concern is about the original language that requires a minimum of a 67% appointment in order to serve.

Professor French said the question is how is "regular" faculty defined, and it seems to be defined as someone who has a minimum of a 67% appointment. This definition could be redefined to include faculty on phased retirement, etc.

As Professor Campbell recalled, it was the sense of the committee in its previous discussions on this matter that people who had appointments below 67% were not full-time members of the University community. Although, he added half jokingly, technically there are also people who have 100% appointments who are not necessarily good members of the University community. With that said, he is not sure whether making a policy around individuals is such a good idea.

Professor Curley said he could see where members of the Senate may pushback on this matter. Professor Okediji said that it is likely there are other University policies that define what constitutes a "regular" faculty member and so whatever the FCC recommends needs to be consistent with other University policies. She cautioned the committee on making a change that has not been studied carefully.

Professor French suggested, at least for now, tabling the proposed clarifying language to Article III, Section 2(d) of the Faculty Senate bylaws and Article IV, Section 2(a). Hearing no further discussion, members unanimously approved the proposed Faculty Senate bylaw changes with the exception of the proposed changes to Article III, Section 2(d) of the Faculty Senate bylaws and Article IV, Section 2(a). She said these two sections would remain as currently written until the committee has time to discuss the 67% minimum appointment threshold matter further.

**4. System-Wide Strategic Plan:** Professor Campbell called on Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Rebecca Ropers-Huilman to lead the System-Wide Strategic Plan discussion. Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman began by introducing herself and asked Chancellor Stephen Lehmkuhle, and Meredith Fox, CEO, Portage Partners Consulting, to do the same. Copies of the draft System-Wide Strategic Plan that had been sent out along with the agenda were distributed again to those present.

To put today's discussion about the System-Wide Strategic Plan into context, Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman briefly provided some background information. The purpose of this discussion will be to get feedback from FCC members on the draft plan and its goal of creating a system that is greater than a sum of its parts. She then highlighted different sections of the draft plan for members. Chancellor Lehmkuhle emphasized that this is a system plan, and its intent is to connect units throughout the system to leverage what is being done across the system in a better way. This is a connector plan versus an umbrella plan. Each campus has its own plan, which defines their distinctive contributions to the system overall. Next, Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman solicited members input on the plan.

In terms of equipment and facilities, noted Professor French, there can be high equipment costs and so it would be good if there were ways to use equipment/resources more broadly and support them as well. There are usually resources to purchase new equipment for grants, but it is the maintenance/replacement/technician costs that need to be addressed. Both Chancellor Lehmkuhle and Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman acknowledged this suggestion.

Professor Campbell said assuming this plan is implemented in the next couple years, what will be different than now? The plan, said Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman, contains several ideas about connecting people across campuses, including the idea of "system days" where people from different campuses would be brought together at a set time and place to ensure collaborative decision-making and create more of a sense of community across all the campuses. System days could also be used to showcase faculty members' areas of expertise, e.g., the environmental focus at Morris, the water resources at Duluth, etc. In Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman's opinion, working as a true system will allow people to get to know each other better and be able to use each other as resources. She added that there will likely be opportunities for Twin Cities' faculty to do absolutely nothing different, but there will also be opportunities for Twin Cities' faculty to do a lot of things differently if they see the benefit of doing so to their work.

Professor Pittenger commented that if the University were able to increase its financial support and improve structures to create interdisciplinary programs and experiences it really could make great strides in leveraging the system-wide expertise, but under the current budget structure there are disincentives to work collaboratively. If this issue does not get addressed, the University will not be able to take advantage of itself as a statewide institution. Adding on to this, said Professor French, she thinks that action should be taken right away on items that are known to be barriers so that immediate successes can be shown. Chancellor Lehmkuhle agreed and said things have been identified that are ready to be worked on now such as system-wide enrollment management.

Where will there be the greatest benefits, asked Professor Tiffin, at the central administration level, the dean level, or at the faculty level? In Chancellor Lehmkuhle's opinion, the University does a good job at providing centralized administrative services. Having said that, the goal is to leverage the administrative centralized support so it allows the University to do more things on the academic side of the house. Professor Tiffin suggested in the System-Wide Strategic Plan document that it should include a preface that highlights what is already working well, what is integrated, and where there are opportunities for immediate successes.

Professor Curley commented that what systems do is grow, and get bigger and bigger if left unchecked. Therefore, in the document where it recommends the appointment of a system liaison to work with all the campuses and units to ensure active communication and consultation throughout the system, isn't this something that is already being done by people who are here? To make the case for this position, Chancellor Lehmkuhle explained that the system liaison, as currently envisioned, would be a rotating position to lead the System Council and ensure that the Council's work moved forward with intentionality. Maybe at some point in the future once progress is made there may not be a need for this type of structure because it will happen on its own. From his perspective, these kinds of conversations need to be structured and done more intentionally. Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman added that the System-Wide Strategic Plan will clarify, for example, the responsibilities of every system-wide administrator because currently it is not clear. This information is currently being collected. What is being envisioned for the system liaison is participation in decision-making at high levels of the institution.

On a related note regarding the System Council and the system liaison, Professor Krichbaum said she worries about yet another layer of administration, and, if a System Council already exists, why isn't it being used? Additionally, it seems like the University could accomplish so much more if there was better technology connectivity between the campuses. Rather than adding another layer of administration, resources should be directed to improving the technology for connectivity purposes. Chancellor Lehmkuhle said the system liaison position as he mentioned before is being viewed as a rotating position (e.g., two years) that would be a leadership development opportunity. He also noted that what is being proposed is a re-visioning of the System Council with different membership and a different purpose. He added that regarding the concern over adding another layer of administration, this is very much on the System-Wide Strategic Planning Committee's radar. In terms of the technology concerns, the committee has heard from members that there is real value in getting together live versus over the phone. Having said that, an idea that has been suggested is the concept of "system days,"

which Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman already mentioned, and Chancellor Lehmkuhle went on to explain in more detail.

Professor Spannaus-Martin, faculty legislative liaison, said what she sees missing from this draft System-Wide Strategic Plan is interaction with the legislature. She said she has been meeting with senators and representatives, and many do not understand what goes on at the University in terms of its core mission. The legislative portion of this plan needs to incorporate what is happening on all the campuses so this can be communicated to legislators. Chancellor Lehmkuhle said while the System-Wide Strategic Plan document is an internal document, it will need to be able to communicate the University's needs to legislators. Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman commented on the importance of understanding what is happening on each of the campuses because if the people who are to represent and make decisions for the entire University do not know what is going on in units across the system, they cannot neither value nor represent those units.

Professor Okediji said that every so many years the University community gets some sort of strategic plan, and the sentiment among some faculty is "Oh no, not again." With that said, how is this plan going to be different than the plans that came before? It would be useful to have the answer to this question articulated. Second, in Professor Okediji's opinion, the University can be great as a system even if all the campuses are not great in the same way or at the same time. Thought should be given to ways in which a couple campuses can leverage each other's strengths in a particular area as opposed to the entire system. Success stories like these should be identified and shared. Lastly, she suggested the system liaison role be given careful thought because the University is a huge system, and if the system liaison's role is to liaise around all the campuses, she is concerned the system liaison will get bogged down before he/she has had time to take off. Rather than having a system liaison, maybe there could be a system hub with a lot of different spokes rather than someone that needs to be a spoke for the entire system.

Professor Campbell thanked Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman, Chancellor Lehmkuhle, and Ms. Fox for a good conversation.

**5. Adjournment:** Professor Campbell adjourned the FCC meeting and said the SCC meeting, which immediately follows the FCC meeting, will start in a few minutes.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate Office